

REMARKS

This paper is responsive to the Final Office Action dated August 9, 2007. A Request for Continued Examination (RCE) is filed herewith. All rejections and objections of the Examiner are respectfully traversed. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner contact Applicants' Attorney David Dagg at (617) 630-1131 to schedule a telephone interview to discuss the distinctions of the present claims over the cited references.

At paragraphs 4-5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 10-15, 19-25, 28 and 29 for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103, citing the combination of United States patent number 5,793,365 of Tang et al. and United States patent number 7,076,043 of Curbow et al. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

As noted in the previous response, Tang et al. disclose a system for providing each networked computer user with a user interface displaying visual representations of workers in the user's workgroup, and communication mechanisms for efficiently and easily contacting any of the displayed workers. The visual representations of other users in Tang et al. indicate the activity level of the other users, to help predict if the other users are likely to be available for an interaction.

More specifically, a gallery window disclosed in Tang et al. includes visual representations of a current worker's work group, and a worker may be required to decide or select which other workers' visual representations are displayed in the gallery window. As shown in Fig. 3 of Tang et al., if the gallery is used to initiate a desktop video-conference, a separate display window is provided referred to as a glance window. The glance window of Tang et al. provides panels of video stream data for each of the participants of the video-conference, and

includes an object portal that allows the participants to pass data by cut and paste (or drag and drop) operations. If a worker is already engaged in a desktop video teleconference when the current worker attempts to communicate with that worker, the glance window of Tang et al. displays the names of the participants and/or provides their images to the current worker. This allows the current worker to use the Tang et al. system to determine if it is appropriate to attempt to join in the ongoing interaction.

Curbow et al. disclose a system for using presence information to delay dialing phone calls initiated by a caller to a callee. The delayed call dialing processing system of Curbow et al. includes logic that allows a caller wishing to call a callee to delegate the task of monitoring presence information to detect when the callee is present to accept the call. The delayed call dialing process in the Curbow et al. system further allows the caller to delegate the task of monitoring the delayed call and then makes the delegated task visible to the caller to enable the caller to either reschedule the delayed call or cancel the delayed call after the call has been queued for delayed dialing. When presence information indicates that the caller and the callee are available, the Curbow et al. system puts the call through.

Nowhere in the combination of Tang et al. and Curbow et al. is there disclosed or suggested any method for providing a local user with the identities of users with whom a remote user has been communicating, including:

obtaining a plurality of user representations, *each of said plurality of user representations corresponding to a respective one of a plurality of users with whom said selected remote user previously communicated across a plurality of different communication applications, wherein said plurality of different communication applications includes electronic mail;* and

presenting said plurality of user representations in a computer system display, wherein all of said plurality of user representations are presented simultaneously in said computer system display, and wherein said plurality of user representations are presented

in an order corresponding to an order in which said remote user previously communicated with each of said users. (emphasis added)

as in the present independent claim 1. Neither Tang et al. or Curbow et al. provide any way to view representations of users with whom a remote user has *previously* communicated across a plurality of different communication applications including *electronic mail*, as in the present independent claims. In contrast, the information displayed in Tang et al. is with regard to a *single current video conference session in a single video conference application* (see column 8 lines 21-51), and the status of other users collected by Curbow et al. is the other users' *current* online status (see lines 56-58 in column 6: "The delayed dialer 280 then queries the present information service 220 for information on User B to determine if he/she is available now."). Accordingly, neither Tang et al. nor Curbow et al., taken alone or in combination, provide any hint or suggestion of even the desirability of presenting user representations of other users with whom a remote user has previously communicated across a plurality of different communication applications, including electronic mail, as in the present independent claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, Tang et al. and Curbow et al. fail to support a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103 with regard to the present independent claim 1. Applicants accordingly respectfully urge that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 103 be withdrawn.

Independent claim 10 also stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 based on the combination of Tang et al. and Curbow et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claim 10 recites a system for providing a local user with the identities of users with whom a remote user has been communicating, including:

means for obtaining a plurality of user representations, *each of said plurality of user representations corresponding to a respective one of a plurality of users with whom said selected remote user previously communicated across a plurality of different communication applications, wherein said plurality of different communication applications includes electronic mail*; and

means for presenting said plurality of user representations in a computer system display, wherein all of said plurality of user representations are presented simultaneously in said computer system display, and wherein said plurality of user representations are presented in an order corresponding to an order in which said remote user previously communicated with each of said users. (emphasis added)

For reasons that should be clear from the discussion of Tang et al. and Curbow et al. set forth above, the combination of Tang et al. and Curbow et al. does not support a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103 with regard to the system of claim 10, including the claimed presenting user representations of other users with whom a remote user has previously communicated across a plurality of different communication applications, where the plurality of different communication applications include electronic mail.

In view of the foregoing, claim 10 patentably distinguishes over the combination of Tang et al. and Curbow et al. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103 based on the combination of Tang et al. and Curbow et al. be withdrawn.

Independent claim 19 also stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 based on the combination of Tang et al. and Curbow et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claim 19 recites a computer program product, wherein said computer program product includes a computer readable medium, the computer readable medium having a computer program for providing a local user with the identities of users with whom a remote user has been communicating stored thereon, the computer program including:

program code for obtaining a plurality of user representations, *each of said plurality of user representations corresponding to a respective one of a plurality of users with whom said selected remote user previously communicated across a plurality of different communication applications, wherein said plurality of different communication applications includes electronic mail*; and

program code for presenting said plurality of user representations in a computer system display, wherein all of said plurality of user representations are presented simultaneously in said computer system display, and wherein said plurality of user representations are presented in an order corresponding to an order in which said remote user previously communicated with each of said users. (emphasis added)

For reasons that should be clear from the discussion of Tang et al. and Curbow et al. set forth above, the combination of Tang et al. and Curbow et al. does not support a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103 with regard to the program product of claim 19, including the claimed presenting user representations of other users with whom a remote user has previously communicated across a plurality of different communication applications, where the plurality of different communication applications include electronic mail.

In view of the foregoing, claim 19 patentably distinguishes over the combination of Tang et al. and Curbow et al. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. 103 based on the combination of Tang et al. and Curbow et al. be withdrawn.

Independent claim 28 also stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 based on the combination of Tang et al. and Curbow et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claim 28 recites a system for providing a local user with the identities of users with whom a remote user has been communicating, including:

program code, stored in a computer readable memory communicably coupled to at least one processor, for obtaining a plurality of user representations, *each of said plurality of user representations corresponding to a respective one of a plurality of users with whom said selected remote user previously communicated across a plurality of different communication applications, wherein said plurality of different communication applications includes electronic mail*; and

program code, stored in said computer readable memory, for ***presenting said plurality of user representations in a computer system display***, wherein all of said plurality of user representations are presented simultaneously in said computer system display, and wherein said plurality of user representations are presented in an order corresponding to an order in which said remote user previously communicated with each of said users. (emphasis added)

For reasons that should be clear from the discussion of Tang et al. and Curbow et al. set forth above, the combination of Tang et al. and Curbow et al. does not support a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103 with regard to the system of claim 28, including the claimed presenting user representations of other users with whom a remote user has previously communicated across a plurality of different communication applications, where the plurality of different communication applications include electronic mail.

In view of the foregoing, claim 28 patentably distinguishes over the combination of Tang et al. and Curbow et al. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 28 under 35 U.S.C. 103 based on the combination of Tang et al. and Curbow et al. be withdrawn.

With regard to dependent claims 2-6, 11-15, and 20-25, they each depend from independent claims 1, 10, and 19, and are respectfully believed to be patentable over the combination of Tang et al. and Curbow et al. for at least the same reasons as set forth for those independent claims above.

In paragraph 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected dependent claims 7-9, 16-18 and 25-27 for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103, again citing the combination of Tang et al. and Curbow et al., and further in combination with United States patent number 6,697,840 of Godefroid et al. ("Godefroid et al."). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

As discussed above, the combination of Tang et al. and Curbow et al. fails to disclose or suggest the features of presenting user representations of other users with whom a remote user

has previously communicated across a plurality of different communication applications, where the plurality of different communication applications include electronic mail, as in the present independent claims. The addition of Godefroid et al. fails to remedy this deficiency of the disclosures of both Tang et al. and Curbow et al. Similar to Curbow et al., Godefroid et al. operates based on awareness of a *current* on-line presence status for remote users. A user of the Godefroid et al. system can update his or her presence information, and the Godefroid et al. system automatically collects presence information about the user and automatically updates his or her presence information. Accordingly, the combination of Tang et al., Curbow et al., and Godefroid et al. does not support a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103 with regard to the features of the present independent claims, and dependent claims 7-9, 16-18, and 25-27 are respectfully believed to be patentable over the combination of Tang et al., Curbow et al. and Godefroid et al. for at least the same reasons.

Reconsideration of all claims is respectfully requested.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Applicants' Attorney at the number listed below so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

December 23, 2007
Date

/David Dagg/
David A. Dagg, Reg. No. 37,809
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
McGuinness & Manaras LLP
125 Nagog Park
Acton, MA 01720
(617) 630-1131

Docket No. 260-011